

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has objected to the oath or declaration because of an incorrect statement regarding the duty to disclose. Applicants submit herewith an amended Declaration and Power of Attorney to correct the error.

Claims 8-22 are pending in the application.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 12, 17 and 22 contain allowable subject matter.

Claim 17 stands objected to because of a typographical error. Applicants have amended the typographical error herein.

Claim 18 stands objected to as being in improper form for multiple dependency.

Claims 8-11, 13-15, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,037,758 to Karasawa et al. The Examiner asserts that Karasawa discloses a surface protective sheet used for grinding a back surface of a semiconductor wafer comprising a base sheet having an opening with a diameter smaller than an outer diameter of the semiconductor wafer, the opening having no adhesive layer being formed, a portion around the opening portion having adhesive layer. In addition, the Examiner states that Karasawa discloses a method for grinding a semiconductor wafer comprising providing surface protective sheet above, and grinding a back surface of the semiconductor wafer.

Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Karasawa. Although the Examiner admits that Karasawa does not disclose each bump is 50 $\mu$  or more, positioned 2 to 10 mm from the outer periphery of the wafer, the Examiner asserts that discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

Claims 12, 17 and 22 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 16 is not subject to any ground of rejection and, accordingly, is deemed to contain allowable subject matter as well.

In response, Applicants have canceled claims 8, 10, 13, 14, 18 and 19 and rewritten claims 12, 16, 17 and 22 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 9 and 11 now depend from rewritten claim 12, claim 15 is now dependent on rewritten claim 16, and claims 20 and 21 now depend


Appl. No. 10/575,510  
Amdt. dated Aug. 14, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of May 14, 2007  
Attorney Docket No. 1217-060907

from rewritten claim 17. Accordingly, these dependent claims are deemed to be in condition for allowance because they depend from allowable base claims.

Applicants assert that the amended claims 9, 11, 12, 15-17 and 20-22 are in condition for allowance. The Examiner's reconsideration and allowance of claims 9, 11, 12, 15-17 and 20-22 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By \_\_\_\_\_

  
Kent E. Baldauf  
Registration No. 25,826  
Attorney for Applicants  
700 Koppers Building  
436 Seventh Avenue  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219  
Telephone: 412-471-8815  
Facsimile: 412-471-4094